School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council
Meeting Minutes

November 29, 2000
State Board Room
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

Chairperson Benny Lile called the meeting to order at 9:08 a.m. EST. The membership was roll was called with the following members present:

Dale Campbell	Benny Lile	Dr. H. M. Snodgrass
Kay Freeland	Gary Meilcarek	Nancy Sutton
Suzanne Guyer	Henry Ormsby	Roxie Tempus
Varetta Hurt	Robert Sexton	Maynard Thomas

Agenda Item

- **Status of New Appointments to the   Benny Lile
  School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability
  Council (SCAAC) and Election of New Chair Person**

Presentation Overview:
As defined in KRS 158.6452, a School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council (SCAAC) was created to study, review and make recommendations to the Kentucky Board of Education and the Legislative Research Commission on setting academic standards, assessing learning, holding schools accountable for learning and assisting schools to improve their performance. SCAAC is composed of seventeen voting members appointed by the Governor. Members shall serve terms of two years with no member serving more that two consecutive terms. Membership is two parents, two teachers, two superintendents, two principals, two local school board members, two school district assessment coordinators, two employers in the state, two university professors with expertise in assessment and measurement, and one at-large member. SCAAC shall elect a chair annually from its membership.

Benny Lile, current chair, introduced the Governors' new appointment members and reappointment members.

New Appointments:

Deloris (Varetta) Hurt	Teachers
Henry V. Ormsby	Employers in the State
Dr. Jacqueline Pope-Tarrence	Local School Board Members
Dr. H. M. Snodgrass	Superintendents
Roxie R. Tempus	Parents

Reappointments:

Benny Lile	District Assessment Coordinators
Gary Mielcarek	Employers in the State
Roger Pankratz	University
Maynard Thomas	Parents

A personal thank you note from the council chair will be sent to the leaving members: Sam Helton, Bonnie Lynch, John Stephens, Sharon Whitworth and Robert Young.

On an annual basis the Council shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-chair. At the September 2000 meeting the Council passed a motion to wait in naming a new chairperson until new members were appointed.

Kay Freeland made a motion to nominate Benny Lile as the Council Chair. The motion was seconded by Robert Sexton. There was a motion to close the nominations. The Council voted and the motion passed unanimously.

Robert Sexton made a motion to nominate Maynard Thomas as the Vice-Chair. The motion was seconded by Kay Freeland. There was a motion to close the nominations. The council voted on the nomination of Maynard Thomas and the motion passed unanimously.

New Agenda Item

- ## Message from the Commissioner   Gene Wilhoit

Commissioner Gene Wilhoit provided council members a briefing on state visits. To date 600 people have attend the forums and the audience has been parents, teachers, and administrators. There is positive response to the forums and people are supportive of the reform.

The general consensus from the meetings is:
- ✓ Special Education parents want to know what the Department is doing in the next years to continue student inclusion.
- ✓ Parents want more information on how they can help their children with instruction at home.
- ✓ Teachers are not providing a common message. Some are frustrated with too much paperwork. Items singled out are consolidated planning and lesson plans. Then you have teachers at other schools who are very supportive of the reform.
- ✓ Administrators are raising issues that are in the way of reform. We will be working on these.
- ✓ Teachers, parents, and administrators want the Department of Education to relate to them as individuals.
- ✓ Teachers and administrators are not supportive of the proposed student accountability process.
- ✓ Support exists for including Commonwealth Accountability Testing System results in KEES.

The forums are a positive experience and there will be more meetings in the winter and spring.

There are assessment and accountabilities difficulties down the road for the reform. Schools have not felt the impact of the long-term accountability model. The feedback will start after standard setting is complete and they have their baselines. Many schools are on track for getting to proficiency by 2014 while other schools will see major changes. SCAAC will have discussions in the future with recommendations on how schools can reach the 100 goal.

Agenda Item

- **Draft minutes from September 27, 2000 Meeting   Benny Lile**

The members reviewed the minutes from the September 27 meeting and there were no corrections. Robert Sexton made a motion to approve the minutes. The motion was seconded by Suzanne Guyer. The Council voted and the motion passed without opposition.

- **Longitudinal Assessment Options and Issues   Scott Trimble**

Presentation Overview:
In 1998 Legislative session, the Kentucky General Assembly passed House Bill 53 that amended KRS 158.6453 to require the development of a "technically sound longitudinal comparison of the assessment results for the same students." Kentucky Department of

Education staff have been working with the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA), the Educational, Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee (EAARS), and School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council (SCAAC) to create a model that is consistent with the statute requirements. The Department has been looking at two models:
- o Model 1: Predicting Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) performance from a norm referenced test (NRT).
- o Model 2: Re-testing low-performing students with the same version of the KCCT at the subsequent grade level.

After recent advice from EAARS at its November meeting, KDE staff are recommending Model 2 and that it be expanded to retest all students in reading at the elementary level instead of just the Novice and Low Apprentice scoring students with the following considerations:
- o Focus on the elementary, and possibly the middle school level.
- o Focus on reading and perhaps mathematics.
- o Include the longitudinal assessment component in school accountability after evaluating the instructional impact.
- o Determine the role (if any) spring 2001 piloting can and should serve.
- o Determine the corrective actions needed if spring 2001 piloting is to be administered based on spring 2000 logistical pilot experiences.
- o Monitor validity and reliability issues.
- o Be consistent with the larger Commonwealth Accountability Testing System.
- o Re-testing students with the same version of the KCCT at the subsequent grade level.

The Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee (EAARS) members feel that the Department should use KCCT to measure longitudinal performance in reading at elementary and to lesser extent at the middle school level. Members, to a lesser extent, felt that mathematics at elementary and middle school also be measured. In view of the technical reservations raised in regard to Model 1 (predicting KCCT from the NRT), EAARS felt that this model would not be an appropriate solution to the longitudinal assessment requirements in statute.

Department staff and National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) members have real concerns about recommending Model 1 since the NRT only addresses 30 to 40 percent of the Kentucky Core Content for Assessment. This determination was made by a panel of Kentucky teachers when they reviewed the proposals for the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System. The NRT addresses basic skills while the Kentucky Core Content Test addresses both basic and high order thinking skills and the application of these skills, not just basic skills. Model 1 would apply a predictive model based an NRT test thought to address about 30 to 40 percent of the Kentucky Core Content For Assessment .

The logistical pilot study of Model 2 in spring 2000 was conducted with approximately 6000 students at grade 5 taking the same reading assessment as in spring 1999 and approximately 6000 grade 6 students taking the same mathematics assessment as in spring 1999. There were logistical issues with the retest, especially tracking students at grade 6 who often were now located at a different school i.e. Grade 5 elementary and grade 6 middle school. The committees that have previously review this proposal feel that reading is the key skill. As previously reported to this committee, testing Novice and Apprentice low students only singled out a specific kind of student and left these students feeling labeled as "low performing."

Three variations of Model 2 were reviewed:
- Retesting Novice and Apprentice (or Low Apprentice) performing students in the next grade.
- Administering the Kentucky Core Content Test in the grade prior to the regular required grade: i.e., administering KCCT reading to end of primary students.
- Retesting all students in the next grade.

Department staff, after consulting with SCAAC and other experts, feel that the current KCCT test is not appropriate for administration at the primary grade level. Students would be assessed on content that they have not been exposed to and to a testing format that they have never worked with. The proposal technically sounds good, but does not work because of instructional experiences.

SCAAC:
A member felt that the intent of the longitudinal assessment was to track student group improvement and not just individual students. For the longitudinal assessment to be successful, student groups needed to track beyond just one year.

Members wanted to know how information would be used and when the information would be available to 5th grade teachers.

A member stated for the record that the longitudinal assessment had to be longer term and permanent. The existing KCCT system needed to be used and track the Cohort. KDE needs to define the goal and get the state legislature aboard. The Department needs to put in place a system that will easily track students.

Why is reading the only content area being emphasized and why are we doing a longitudinal study?

KDE:
Reading is critical to everything else. NTAPAA and EAARS feel reading is the foundation or gateway skill and if the student is not at the proficient level the school needs to get the student to that level by the end of grade 5. Then the student can move to the middle school

level with at least a solid reading foundation. The intent is to gauge our success in our ability to move students to proficient. The system should be sensitive to performance of students in different years.

SCAAC:
The following motion was made by Henry Ormsby and seconded by Maynard Thomas.

> We support moving forward with a pilot longitudinal program testing all 5th grade students at approximately 30 to 40 selected schools with the 4th grade Kentucky Core Content Test in reading given the previous year at grade 4. This pilot must include appropriate communication with the teachers in the schools involved related to logistical and instructional matters. The participation in this pilot shall be voluntary. The Department should continue looking at tracking students at grades 4, 7 and 10 where KCCT reading score results are currently available, and determine the usefulness of this data in applications to district level reporting and accountability.

The Council voted and the motion passed without opposition.

- ## **CTBS Index for Long-Term Accountability   Scott Trimble**

Presentation Overview:
The Council is being consulted on methods for inclusion of the CTBS Index in the Long-Term Accountability calculations. The Kentucky Department of Education has two proposals under consideration; the SCAAC proposal adopted at the September meeting and the NTAPAA proposal. The Council has been asked to study, review and make recommendations.

Dr. John Poggio, representing NTAPAA is participating in the discussion via telephone. He is explaining the NTAPAA proposal and providing technical expertise on all proposals.

KDE:
The National Norm Referenced Test (NRT) component of the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System is measured with the CTBS/5 Survey Edition. Students are assessed in reading, language arts, and mathematics at end-of primary, grade 6, and grade 9. A review of NRT test questions show only 30% to 40% of the Kentucky Core Content is assessed. NRT tests do not address application and high order thinking.

- NTAPAA calculation.
    Students having a 0 to 49 Total Battery percentile score shall be assigned a score of 0. A score of 140 is assigned to students whose Total Battery percentile ranges

from 50 to 99. The Accountability Index is calculated by summing the student scores and dividing the sum by the number of accountable students in the school.

- SCAAC calculation.
    The SCAAC is identical to the NTAPAA calculation except that there are more score points. The score points are: 0 to 24 Total Battery percentile score = 13, 25% to 49% = 60, 50% to 74% = 100, and 75% to 99% = 140. The Accountability Index is calculated by summing the student scores and dividing the sum by the number of accountable students in the school.

NTAPAA:
Results with both models will result in similar values. NTAPAA recommends staying away from quarters (0 – 24%, 25-49%….) since it sounds so much like performance level classifications of Novice, Apprentice, Proficient, and Distinguished (N,A,P,D). The KCCT does not correlate well with the NRT, thus NRT association with N,A,P,D's should not be emphasized. There are no technical issues in calculating the index by quartiles. SCAAC may want to consider a model based on Stanines. Using the NTAPAA calculation, students with percentiles in the 5th though 9th stanine would receive a score of 140.

SCAAC:
Discussions between Council members occurred on the calculation options, how parents and teachers view scores and what will the media report. The design of NRT tests do not allow schools to improve scores above the 75th percentile. Council members reach consensus that the SCAAC calculation should not favor extremely low scoring schools. Recommendation is to change resulting score for students with 0 to 24 Total Battery percentiles from 13 to 0.

The following motion was made by Kay Freeland and seconded by Suzanne Guyer.

    We recommend that the State Board adopt the SCAAC quartile model for calculating the CTBS Index for Long Term Accountability where the first quartile (student percentile of 0 to 24) shall be assigned a value of 0, the second quartile (25-49 percentile) a value of 60, the third quartile (50-74 percentile) a value of 100, and the fourth quartile (75-99 percentile) a value of 140.

 The Council voted and the motion passed unanimously.

- **Student Accountability** **Scott Trimble**

Presentation Overview:
Teachers have expressed a real concern about student ownership in the state–required assessments. To increase student accountability on the assessments the proposed policy is for inclusion of Commonwealth Accountability Testing System scores in students' GPAs.

KDE:
A new proposal to address student accountability is being considered to respond to teachers concerns. Council members were provided a Draft Staff Note to assist in the explanation of the proposed regulation. The proposal would allow districts the option of inclusion of Kentucky Core Content Test (KCCT) and writing portfolio results in individual student high school GPA calculations. The high school GPA would be calculated consistent with school district policies, with no more than 3% of the maximum possible GPA included in the calculation based on individual student performance on the KCCT and writing portfolio. The proposed policy would optional to school districts. There would be no state mandate to implement this procedure. NTAPAA is supportive of the proposal as long as student scores do not appear on student transcripts.

KDE has asked for advice and feedback from a variety of committees and organizations including: Local Superintendents Advisory Council (LSAC), District Assessment Coordinators, Kentucky Education Association (KEA), KSAC, and PTA. NTAPAA is supportive of the proposal as long as student scores do not appear on student transcripts. LRC lawyers are reviewing since NTAAPA has not certified KCCT results at the student level.

SCAAC:
Council members, while feeling this is the best proposal seen to date, feel this would insignificantly impact student motivation. This proposal will not motivate students that the schools are trying to reach. The additional calculations will create a clerical nightmare for school and district staff. Students do not connect Curriculum with Assessment based on responses of students who have participated in SCAAC meetings. This will disadvantage students who are minorities, have disabilities and economic difficulties.

Council members thought that Student Accountability might be tied to the Kentucky Educational Excellence Scholarship (KEES) Program, Kentucky's merit-based higher education scholarship program. This is a legislative issue and the legislature has chosen to keep the policy the same for a period of time. Henry Ormsby asked that KDE staff provide a list of legislative sub-committee members who oversee the KEES program.

Maynard Thomas made a motion that SCAAC not support this student accountability model because of comments contained in the Staff Note on Student Accountability. The

motion was seconded by Dale Campbell. The Council voted and the motion passed without opposition.

- ## Interim Accountability Rewards and Dropout   Scott Trimble
  ## Criteria – Data Review and Update

Presentation Overview:
Status report from KDE staff on data review, Interim Accountability Rewards and change in Dropout process.

KDE:
Data Review of the Spring 2000 Kentucky Core Content Test is moving forward smoothly. Procedures for Interim Accountability Rewards have been e-mailed to District Assessment Coordinators (DAC's). In January, DAC's will receive the CATS Certified Staff lists for schools to verify and update staff at the schools on the last day of the 1999-2000 School year. Six High Schools are being denied rewards because their dropout rate exceeded 8.0 percent. A seventh High School is now eligible for rewards with their corrected dropout numbers. The original dropout numbers had been miss-reported.

 KDE is changing the definition on capture of dropout data. The calendar year for dropout data has been changed from October to October to July to July. The change in definition has not affected accountability results. The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) is not willing for Kentucky to report nonacademic data with an October date, so reporting data is moved to July.

SCAAC:
Council members discussed the need for Kentucky to have a student tracking system which will assist school staff in capture student cognitive and non-academic data for students attending non-A1 schools who are accountable to A1 schools.

- ## School Report Card   Scott Trimble

Presentation Overview:
Status report on regulation 703. KAR 5:140 Requirements for School and District Report Cards and an update on the operational condition of current year reporting.

KDE:
The regulation has been sent to the Legislative Research Commission (LRC) and returned with some recommendations. KDE staff have also suggested refinements.

The proposed regulation establishes four major components of the school report card:
- ✓ School report card (base) sent to all parents and guardians of district students.
- ✓ District report card (base) to be published in the newspaper with the largest paid circulation in each count.
- ✓ School and District cards (expanded) with a wealth of additional information including detailed disaggregation data. The cards shall be available in the school and district offices.

LRC staff expressed concerns about the availability of disaggregation data required by statute to the parents and pubic. The draft regulation stated that while parents could view the expanded cards for free, they could be charged the cost of copying if they wished to have the data copied. KDE staff is recommending the placement of a statement in the regulation and upon the base report cards that exempts the disaggregation pages from any copying charge.

LRC staff wants the expanded cards, or portions thereof, to available on the Internet. They also recommend that the draft regulation be amended to encourage local education agencies to place expanded report cards on the Internet as well as the base report cards.

LRC staff expressed concern with regulation's restriction of the report card to A1 schools, the basic unit of accountability under the Commonwealth Accountability Testing System. Since all academic data generated by students attending A2-A6 schools is tracked back to the A1 School which the students are (or would be) enrolled, report cards for A2-A6 schools would not have specific performance data available. KDE staff is recommending that no change be made in this part of the regulation since it is not consistent with other key regulations that support CATS.

LRC staff is concerned about the wording of certain definitions in the regulation concerning per pupil spending. KDE staff have recommended some clarifications in these portions of the proposed regulation while not make definitions more complex.

LRC staff has recommended that only base year data appear on the report cards. This change will limit the content of data available on the report card. KDE staff believes that restricting the content of the report card to the base year is not feasible, since nonacademic data is required by statute and school and district contact information is out of date. The restriction would defeat much of the legislative intent underlying the statute.

LSAC is supporting KDE staffs view.

SCAAC:
A brief discussion between council members occurred followed by Dr. H. M. Snodgrass making a motion that SCAAC accept changes in the Staff Note as indicated. The motion was seconded by Kay Freeland. The Council voted and the motion passed without opposition.

An update was provide by KDE staff to the council on current status of School and District report cards which will be sent to parents and guardians in January 2001.

- **KDE Update**   **Scott Trimble**

Presentation Overview:
Status update on Getting to Proficiency and cross agency teams.

KDE:
Staff provided an update on Getting to Proficiency. Cross agency teams are now active within the Department. Twelve teams have been formed that traverse division and office boundaries. The teams are:
- ✓ Virtual Learning
- ✓ Consolidated Planning
- ✓ Data
- ✓ School Culture / Dropout
- ✓ Leadership
- ✓ Literacy
- ✓ Professional Development / Instruction
- ✓ Reducing the Gap
- ✓ Teacher Quality
- ✓ Elementary
- ✓ Middle School
- ✓ High School

SCAAC:
Council members felt that there is renewed interest in the Middle School Initiative. Grant Money? The council asked that a presentation by KDE staff be placed on the SCAAC agenda for January.

- **Standard Setting Update and**   **Linda H. Frazer**
  Revisit Step 5 of Standard Setting

Presentation Overview:
Update on the Standard Setting process which has been underway since the Fall of 1999.

KDE:
The Standard Setting is a 5 step process which will involve over 1700 Kentucky teachers. Standard Setting work began in the Fall of 1999 with comments from Kentucky educators. In January 2000 (Step 1) 90 teachers developed assessment descriptors for the reading, mathematics, science, social studies, arts and humanities, and practical living / vocational studies content areas. Step 2 is the contrasting groups study where teachers from approximately 200 schools assessed their students performance by categorizing the students as novice, apprentice, proficient or distinguished. Teachers recorded the performance level in conjunction with the Spring 2000 Kentucky Core Content Test in April 2000. Step 3 is the Jaeger-Mills study. In October 2000 325 teachers ……   The CTB Bookmark study (Step 4), with 325 different Kentucky teachers participating will review student work in ordered test books. Teachers will work in groups by content areas of reading, mathematics, science, social studies, arts and humanities, and practical living / vocational studies at the elementary, middle and high school levels. They will set cut-points of novice/apprentice, apprentice/proficient, and proficient/distinguished in ordered test booklets (student responses order from easiest to most difficult). This will occur in Lexington on December 4, 5, and 6.   Findings from Steps 2 and 3 are being held by the contractor so as to not taint Step 4. Findings for the steps will be available to KDE after completion of Step 4.

SCAAC:
Council members reported that teachers were impressed with the process and had gained much insight to the curriculum and assessment testing.   Council members asked for further details on the remaining Step 5 and the State Board adoption process.

KDE:
In late January or early February 2001, information from the four steps will combined to have a Standard Setting recommendation for the Kentucky Board of Education to review and approve. KDE will be turning to NTAPAA for recommendations on a process for consolidating this data. KDE is expecting to invite back approximately 100 to 150 teachers who participated in Steps 1, 2, 3 or 4 to participate in the three day Step 5 synthesis process. The standards need to be set by content area after addressing horizontal (reading, mathematics, science …) and vertical (elementary, middle and high school) alignment compatibility. The content area groups will talk to each other which was

not done in 1992. The teachers will modify the draft descriptors after synthesis of the data from each step.

There is a technical review planned by NTAAPA. NTAPAA is not going to recommend a standard but will suggest issues from the review of each process. KDE expects to bring the findings to a future SCAAC meeting for review and comment prior to State Board review and adoption. This may require a special meeting of the SCAAC council. The Kentucky Board of Education is expected to take up Standard Setting at their April regular scheduled board meeting. A special State Board meeting in May 2001 may be called to just address Standard Setting.

While teachers have participated, committees including NTAPPA and SCAAC, will review and comment on the findings, and KDE has made recommendations, the Kentucky Board of Education has the responsibility for setting the Standards.

SCAAC:
Members wanted assurances that purists will not control the step 5 process; that practical people who are realists are involved. Members asked for a clearer understanding of NTAPAA's role.

KDE:
NTAAPA has signed off on the overall process. A NTAPAA sub-committee will meet on December 14 and 15 with full committee review in January 2001. NTAPAA has advised KDE staff that teachers should make recommendations.

- **Next Meetings**   **Benny Lile**

Presentation Overview: Benny Lile reviewed the dates for the next SCAAC meetings. The meeting dates are:
- January 31, 2001
- March 28, 2001

The council agreed to set the remaining 2001 meeting dates at the January 2001 meeting.

- **Adjournment**   **Benny Lile**

Dr. H. M. Snodgrass made a motion for adjournment and the motion was seconded by Maynard Thomas. The Council voted and the motion passed unanimously.